

1 during -- when they're talking, so that they can get through  
2 their comment.

T001-1.1  
Thank you for the information.

3 With that, let me go ahead and read the first  
4 several names. Andy Stern, Raneika Brooks-McClain, the  
5 Honorable John Olsen, Jim Woolway, Sharon O'Rourke, and  
6 Saul Janson.

7 Again, if you're the first, Andy Stern, you can  
8 come to the mike. If you're the rest of the individuals I  
9 called, if you'd come over to the seating over here and get  
10 ready to take your turn. Thank you.

11 MR. STERN: Good evening. Can you hear me? I  
12 can't hear, is this working?

COMMENTER  
T001-1

13 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Make sure the switch is on.  
14 You just need to get close to the mike, it's on.

15 MR. STERN: Good evening, I'm Andy Stern. Still  
16 can't.

17 (Microphone adjustment.)

18 MR. STERN: How about now? There it goes.

19 Good evening, welcome to Malibu. Thank you so  
20 much to come here, to hear our comments tonight.

21 I'm Andy Stern, I'm the Mayor Pro Tem of Malibu,  
22 and a long-time member and former Chairman of the Los  
23 Angeles County Beach Commission.

24 As each of you knows, the City of Malibu has  
25 already passed a resolution in complete opposition to this

T001-1.1

1 project.

2 I urge you to look very closely at any proposed  
3 LNG facility, including the one being presented by BHP  
4 Billiton.

5 While one may argue that LNG is a cleaner burning  
6 fuel, and that there is a need to find an answer to growing  
7 energy demand in our country, I cannot imagine why, in my  
8 wildest dreams, anyone would consider putting a facility,  
9 such as this one being discussed here, tonight, near a  
10 populated area.

11 I've reviewed the information in the EIR and  
12 discussed with members of our community. Universally, to  
13 every person I've spoken to, there is a belief that we must  
14 not jump into this project without close consultation with  
15 all the impacted communities, and consideration of issues  
16 raised by vocal opponents to the siting of any LNG project  
17 in California.

18 The facility must not pose great local and  
19 regional hazards to our communities and sealife, must not  
20 include a fixed, stationery platform that risks the wildlife  
21 and sealife of the Channel Islands Preserve, and must take  
22 into consideration the bigger picture, that includes how we  
23 manage the LNG needs of our State, and how we develop an  
24 infrastructure to handle it.

25 The things that I've heard about how safe this is

#### T001-1.2

Section 3.3.7 contains information on the specific California locations considered in the alternatives analysis. The deepwater port would be 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore, as shown on Figure ES-1.

#### T001-1.3

Sections 1.5 and 1.6 contain information on opportunities for public comment and the approval process.

#### T001-1.4

Section 4.2 and Appendix C contain additional and revised information on public safety.

As described in Sections 2.1 and 2.3.1, and as depicted on Figure 2.1-1, the FSRU would be a floating facility that would be moored to the seafloor. It would not be a fixed platform.

The FSRU would be located outside of the current boundary of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) and vessels associated with the operations would not be expected to enter the CINMS. Sections 4.7, 4.15, 4.16, and 4.18 describe potential impacts on the marine environment and proposed mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts.

Section 1.2.3 addresses natural gas needs in California and has been updated. Forecast information has been obtained from the California Energy Commission.

T001-1.2

T001-1.3

T001-1.4

1 reminds me of what the government told the people of Las  
2 Vegas, when they were invited to the desert to watch the  
3 testing of nuclear bombs. Come on, bring the family, watch  
4 the fantastic light show. We all know what happened to many  
5 of those people that went and watched.

6 If you care about us, if you care about our  
7 community, and other nearby communities, I urge you to do  
8 the one environmentally safe thing to do. I urge you to do  
9 the safest thing. I urge you to do the one thing that will  
10 guarantee our safety, and that is to do everything in your  
11 power to make sure this thing is not built at all.

12 Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: The next speaker is Raneika  
15 Brooks-McClain.

16 MS. BROOKS-MC CLAIN: Thank you. Good evening.  
17 My name is Raneika Brooks-McClain, and I'm a City Planner,  
18 with the City of Malibu Planning Division.

19 On behalf of the City of Malibu, I would like to  
20 thank you for the opportunity to speak on the potential  
21 environmental impacts of the proposed Cabrillo Port  
22 Liquefied Natural Gas Deepwater Port.

23 On May 22nd, 2004 the City of Malibu, City Council  
24 adopted Resolution 04-32, strongly opposing the proposed  
25 liquefied natural gas port.

T001-1.5

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T001-2.1

Thank you for the information.

T001-1.5

COMMENTER  
T001-2

T001-2.1

1           The City's opposition is based on several factors,  
2 including the Vision Statement contained in the Malibu  
3 General Plan, which affirms that the people of Malibu are  
4 committed to protecting the environment and to preserving  
5 Malibu's unaltered natural resources.

T001-2.1  
(cont'd)

6           The residents of Malibu are responsible custodians  
7 of the area's natural resources for present and future  
8 generations.

9           The Vision Statement provides, and I quote:

10           "Malibu is a unique land and marine  
11 environment, and residential community,  
12 whose citizens have historically  
13 evidenced a commitment to sacrifice  
14 urban and suburban conveniences in order  
15 to protect that environment and  
16 lifestyle and to preserve unaltered  
17 natural resources and rural  
18 characteristics.

19           "The people of Malibu are  
20 responsible custodians of the area's  
21 natural resources for present and future  
22 generations."

23           Now, with the obligation and responsibility to  
24 protect the area's natural resources, the City of Malibu  
25 cannot, in good faith, support this project that is believed



23

T001-2.2

1 to impose an increased risk to public health and safety.

2 The City of Malibu believes the draft

T001-2.3

3 Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact  
4 Report are inadequate in its assessment of the potential  
5 environmental impacts and risks to public health and safety  
6 by failing to accurately assess catastrophic events that  
7 might result from a terrorist attack on the proposed  
8 project.

9 LNG's inherently volatile nature make the  
10 transport, storage, and regasification remain a serious  
11 hazard that cannot be ignored.

T001-2.4

12 The City of Malibu believes that the proposed LNG  
13 terminal and ports can harm human and marine life, leave our  
14 ocean forever altered, and destroy properties.

T001-2.5

15 Specifically, a large explosion and blast wave set  
16 off, perhaps by an earthquake or a terrorist attack, will  
17 result in loss of human and marine life, and property.

18 The City of Malibu continues our review of the  
19 environmental document and will offer more specific  
20 comments, in writing, by the December 20th deadline.

21 Thank you.

22 (Applause.)

23 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: The Honorable John Olsen.

24 AUSTRALIAN COUNSEL GENERAL OLSEN: Good evening.

25 John Olsen, Australian Counsel General for the West Coast of

COMMENTER  
T001-3

T001-2.2

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T001-2.3

Table 4.2-2 and Sections 4.2.6.1 and 4.2.7.6 contain information on the threat of terrorist attacks.

T001-2.4

Section 4.2.7.1 contains information on LNG properties and hazards.

T001-2.5

Section 4.2 and Appendix C contain additional and revised information on public safety, including information on the threat of terrorist attacks. Sections 4.7, 4.15, 4.16, and 4.18 contain information on marine biological, recreational, socioeconomic, and water quality impacts. Section 4.11 contains information on seismic and geologic hazards.

T001-3

Thank you for the information.

1 the United States. I think you for the opportunity to make  
2 some remarks to the panel, this evening.

T001-3.1

3 I'd like to cover three aspects, Australian/U.S.  
4 relationships, Australia as a supplier of LNG, and BHP  
5 Billiton's standing within Australia.

6 In four weeks time, from today, the 1st of  
7 January, the United States/Australia Free Trade Agreement  
8 comes into force.

9 In four weeks time from today, 99 percent of  
10 manufactured goods in the United States will have free and  
11 unimpeded access to the Australian marketplace.

12 Currently, there is a trade surplus to California  
13 of nearly two billion dollars in manufactured goods and  
14 services from California, accessing Australia.

15 In addition to that, some five to eight billion  
16 dollars, annually, in surplus trade from the United States,  
17 goes to Australia.

18 I note that we're one nation, of few, with whom  
19 the United States has a surplus of trade.

20 Australia has ample supplies of LNG, some eight  
21 million tons per annum, increasing to some 40 million tons  
22 per annum are able, under current levels of gas, to be  
23 available for export.

24 We have some proven reserves of 143 trillion cubic  
25 feet, as of January 2003, considered conservative within the

1 industry.

2 The new capacity, under construction, would enable  
3 that to double over the next four years.

4 Australia is a reliable and competitive LNG  
5 exporter. Australia is the only major LNG exporter that is  
6 a Western Nation.

7 Why do I mention that? Simply because Australia  
8 and the United States have been allies and friends. Last  
9 century, and this century, on every time there's been  
10 international conflict, Australia has stood foursquare  
11 behind the United States and vice-versa.

12 Australia has standards, high standards in  
13 construction and maintenance. We have a highly educated  
14 workforce, with high levels of skill, sophisticated  
15 information and telecommunications structure and  
16 environment, politically stable environment, an impeccable  
17 LNG safety record.

18 Over 20 years, from the Northwest Shelf, 1,600  
19 shipments of LNG have gone to the Asia/Pacific region.  
20 There has not been one incident during that period of time.  
21 Australia takes its security issues seriously.

22 We do not allow ships of convenience to take this  
23 product, they are ships flagged by Australia, British, and  
24 Japanese interests.

25 BHP Billiton is Australia's largest company. It

T001-3.1  
(cont'd)

1 is the world's largest diversified resource company.

2 BHP Billiton, in its track record and performance  
3 in Australia, has been an outstanding community citizen.

4 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

5 AUSTRALIAN COUNSEL GENERAL OLSEN: Thank you for  
6 the opportunity to present and the courtesy with which it's  
7 been received.

8 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Jim Woolway.

9 MR. WOOLWAY: I'm Jim Woolway, and I live in Chula  
10 Vista, California, San Diego County.

11 And I am here at the request of an old shipmate,  
12 as well as a union brother in the marine industry, when we  
13 both sailed aboard LNG carriers in the Far East trade.

14 I'm retired from the Navy, and after 26 years. I  
15 was aboard cruisers and destroyers, and commanded several  
16 Navy ships, including a destroyer.

17 When I retired in 1978, I received my Master's  
18 license from the Coast Guard, and looking for a job, I went  
19 with the Marine Engineer's Beneficial Association, and their  
20 association with the LNG trade in the Far East, trading  
21 between Borneo and Japan.

22 So I received my training in Baltimore for several  
23 months, then another eight months aboard ship. And then I  
24 became a cargo officer, chief mate, and relief master.

25 We delivered our cargos, of 55,000 tons, about, of

T001-4  
Thank you for the information.

T001-3.1  
(cont'd)

COMMENTER  
T001-4



1 125,000 cubic meters. Usually, they're talking cubic meters  
2 here. And my ship was one of eight, of a similar type, that  
3 carried about 19 million cubic meters of LNG to Japan ports  
4 during the 16 years that I sailed in the Far East.

5           These were American flags at that time. And there  
6 were other flag carriers, of course, delivering to Japan.

7           Unlike the Cabrillo project here, we did not  
8 deliver at sea. We actually went into the Inland Sea and  
9 delivered our cargo to Kanagi, in fact right near Kobe. And  
10 I know you've read of the big earthquakes they had over  
11 there, there were a number of times we were in port,  
12 delivering cargo, and we had earthquakes. You don't really  
13 feel them so much on the ship. But as you know, they had  
14 some tragic ones there.

15           But that never caused a single incident. When  
16 that was mentioned earlier. I want to say that our record,  
17 also, was unblemished as far as delivering the cargo.

18           One of the nice advantages of LNG is I say it's a  
19 benign type of cargo. It doesn't mix toxically with other  
20 things. You can spray water on it. If you have a leaky  
21 flange, you can determine where it is very quickly and take  
22 what's necessary to fix it.

23           The thing is, from my point of view as a cargo  
24 officer, working with it every day, where we monitor, of  
25 course, what we have in those tanks, we carry it at only one

1 pound of pressure above atmospheric, so you're not dealing  
2 with a heavy pressure situation.

3 Okay, I just wanted to, I hope, allay any fears  
4 that some people have on it, since I did work with it so  
5 many years. Thanks again, I appreciate your patience.

6 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

7 The next speakers will be Sharon O'Rourke, Saul  
8 Janson, Gerard Reyes, Chester Wasko, Jr., George Minter, and  
9 Andy Finan. If you could start making your way up to the  
10 reserved seating, up here to my left, thank you.

11 MS. O'ROURKE: Good evening. My name is Sharon  
12 O'Rourke, I'm a Public Affairs Manager with Southern  
13 California Gas Company.

14 First, I'd like to state that the Gas Company has  
15 no position on the proposed Cabrillo Port LNG facility.

16 Rather, we believe it is up to the local  
17 communities and appropriate regulatory agencies to decide if  
18 and where LNG facilities should be sited, and what  
19 mitigation measures should be required for the approved  
20 facilities.

21 However, gas from this, or from any other site  
22 that gets built in Southern California, will be fed into  
23 Southern California Gas Company's natural gas pipeline  
24 system.

25 I'm here to speak, tonight, on the need for this

T001-5  
Thank you for the information.

COMMENTER  
T001-5

T001-5.1

1 natural gas.

2 Many of us, in Southern California, rely on  
3 natural gas. I'm sure tonight, as we all go home, it's so  
4 cold out that we'll all be thankful that our gas heaters are  
5 working and keeping us warm.

6 The percentage of homes, businesses, and electric  
7 power plants fueled by natural gas is greater in Southern  
8 California than anywhere else in the nation. The Gas  
9 Company delivers nearly one trillion cubic feet of natural  
10 gas annually. That's about four to five percent of all the  
11 natural gas delivered in the United States.

12 Unfortunately, over the last five years, the cost  
13 of natural gas has been increasing and, at the same time,  
14 production has not kept up with demand. These are natural  
15 trends and they are expected to continue.

16 The Gas Company believes more supply sources are  
17 needed, and our customers will reap the benefits with lower  
18 prices and increased reliability.

19 We also strongly believe that our customers'  
20 efforts to reduce demand and conserve energy continues to be  
21 very important. By reducing demand, we can reduce the need  
22 for additional gas supplies.

23 And the Gas Company is committed to continue to  
24 support demand reduction and energy-efficiency programs.  
25 But we don't believe this is enough to offset the total

T001-5.1  
(cont'd)

1 need.

2 We favor adding a diverse set of supply sources to  
3 our system. Potential new supplies may come, for example,  
4 from the Rocky Mountains. But LNG is another, new,  
5 potential source.

6 Finally, let me just say that we believe opening  
7 our system to a diversity of supply will create gas-on-gas  
8 competition that should result in gas prices that are lower  
9 than prices would be without this competition.

10 Thank you.

11 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Saul Janson.

12 MR. JANSON: Yeah, hi. My name's Saul Janson, I'm  
13 just here as a concerned citizen, coastal citizen, who lives  
14 down the coast a little bit.

15 First, I'd like to thank you all for coming. I  
16 think you have to be here, but I'd like to thank you,  
17 anyway.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. JANSON: I thought that the actual company was  
20 going to be here, they were here earlier, but they're not on  
21 the panel at the moment.

22 I've only had a chance to kind of look at the  
23 summary of the EIR. But if we're contemplating having an  
24 LNG facility in our backyard, here, or at least in the pool  
25 in our backyard, I just want to further encourage some

T001-5.1  
(cont'd)

T001-6.1

Section 4.2.7.6 and the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1) contain information on public safety impacts from various incidents at the FSRU. The analysis indicates that the maximum impact distance of an accident would involve a vapor cloud dispersion extending 6.3 nautical miles (7.3 miles) from the FSRU. The FSRU would be located approximately 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore; therefore, consequences of an accident involving LNG transport by carrier and storage on the FSRU would extend no closer than 5.7 nautical miles (6.5 miles) from the shoreline. Figure ES-1 depicts the consequence distances surrounding the FSRU location for worst credible events.

COMMENTER  
T001-6

T001-6.1



1 examination, to make sure that the facility is enough  
2 offshore to protect us from potential explosions, both the  
3 LNG coming in and the facility, itself.

T001-6.1  
(cont'd)

4 I'm concerned that the plant and the LNG process  
5 should not, in any way, encourage the continued development  
6 or future development of oil exploration off the coast, by  
7 using any existing platforms or transfer stations. If  
8 anything is there, it should be put in there and taken out.

T001-6.2

9 The Santa Barbara Channel Islands should be, and  
10 must always be, totally protected and not disturbed.

T001-6.3

11 The plant should be outside any major shipping  
12 lanes.

T001-6.4

13 This also would -- any onshore processing or  
14 facilities must also protect the health and welfare of the  
15 residents onshore.

T001-6.5

16 And in general, the protection of the natural  
17 habitat has to be a priority.

T001-6.6

18 I do understand the need for LNG, it does appear  
19 to be a cleaner alternative, but I think it's important that  
20 as we look at ways to -- how we're going to deal with energy  
21 needs, that this is only viewed as an interim measure, and  
22 that we need to reduce our dependence on foreign sources of  
23 oil in other ways.

T001-6.7

24 I do -- I've heard a lot about these projects and  
25 understand them, but I think we need to protect this

T001-6.2

No offshore oil production is proposed or anticipated to result from the proposed Project. The proposed Project would not use any existing platforms or transfer stations. At the end of the useful life of the proposed Project, the FSRU would be removed. Section 2.8 contains additional information on decommissioning of the FSRU.

T001-6.3

The FSRU would be located outside of the current boundary of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) and vessels associated with Cabrillo Port operations would not be expected to enter the CINMS. Sections 4.7.1.4, 4.13.2.2, and 4.20.1.5 discuss the potential expansion of the CINMS boundary, which is not proposed at this time. Sections 4.7.4, 4.15.4, 4.16.4, and 4.18.4 describe potential impacts on the marine environment and proposed mitigation measures to reduce those potential impacts.

T001-6.4

The FSRU would be located about 2 nautical miles from the nearest shipping lane.

T001-6.5

The proposed Project does not include onshore processing facilities. Section 2.4 contains information regarding proposed onshore facilities. Section 4.2.8 contains information on the public safety of the onshore pipelines, and Appendix C3-3 identifies applicable safety standards.

T001-6.6

Sections 4.7.4 and 4.8.4 contain information on the measures that would be implemented to protect natural habitat.

T001-6.7

Section 1.2 discusses dependence on foreign energy sources.

1 particular area that we live in. Our local economy is very  
2 dependent on the beauty of this area.

T001-6.8

T001-6.8

Section 4.4 and Appendix F contain information on aesthetic impacts on tourists and residents.

3 And I'd also encourage both, I guess, the  
4 governmental agencies, but also the company that's involved,  
5 to actively seek out comments, not just from the people who  
6 are here, and people who are going to write in, but to try  
7 and get the community more involved, and actively involved,  
8 rather than them finding, or having to find you and them.

T001-6.9

T001-6.9

Section 1.1 discusses regulations and agencies involved in the licensing and potential approval of the proposed Project. The USCG and MARAD will hold a final public hearing on the license with a 45-day comment period before the Federal Record of Decision is issued. The CSLC also will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease.

9 Thanks.

10 (Applause.)

11 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Gerard Reyes.

12 MR. REYES: Thank you, I'm happy to be here, and  
13 thank you for being here, as well.

COMMENTER  
T001-7

T001-7

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

14 My name is Gerard Reyes, I'm a private citizen,  
15 and I'm just going to keep it short and simple.

16 There are various aspects to supporting the LNG  
17 development, but I think the obvious ones, that I would just  
18 like to reiterate, that have been somewhat covered, are that  
19 it's a wonderful opportunity to use a cleaner source of  
20 fuel. There's definitely going to be a need for that in the  
21 future, but also just a need for the gas, itself, to help  
22 our economy.

23 And on the subject of the economy, it's also a  
24 wonderful opportunity for people to access jobs, and access  
25 jobs that provide a living standard, which is becoming more

1 and more rare in our society today, unfortunately.

2 It's just, you know, it's obviously a good thing,  
3 and I support it, and I hope that it goes well in the  
4 future. Thank you.

5 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Chester Wasko.

6 MR. WASKO: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

7 I'll state it right off, I'm in favor of the terminal. I'm  
8 in favor of the terminal because it will bring clean fuel to  
9 Southern California. I'm in favor of the terminal because  
10 it will bring good jobs to Southern California, good  
11 construction jobs that we need.

12 And the only reason I'm in favor of that terminal  
13 is that this should be done under a project labor agreement,  
14 which is negotiated with the building trades, the Department  
15 of the AFL-CIO, so that it will ensure good quality work.

16 If we have contractors, such as Kellogg, Brown &  
17 Root out there, we know what happens to our refineries when  
18 those companies work there, they blow up.

19 But if we have good building trades people out  
20 there, building the onshore and offshore facilities, they're  
21 going to be stable, they're going to be safe, they're going  
22 to be a pride for our communities, and they're going to be a  
23 good source of natural gas, uninterrupted source of natural  
24 gas for our communities.

25 We need this for jobs here, in Southern

T001-8

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

COMMENTS T001-8
--------------------

1 California, not only for the building trades, but also for  
2 the industrial trades. We need it for our energy, we need  
3 it for the peaker plants that supply our electricity during  
4 the middle of the summer to provide our air conditioning.  
5 And we need it during the winter to supply our heaters, that  
6 keep us from freezing.

7 And I'd like to thank you very much this evening.  
8 Thank you.

9 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: The last speaker was  
10 Chester Wasko, Jr. If I could ask people to please give us  
11 their name, when they begin their comments, I'd appreciate  
12 it.

13 The next speaker is George Minter.

14 MR. MINTER: Good evening and thank you for being  
15 here tonight. My name's George Minter, Los Angeles,  
16 California.

17 I'm here on behalf of Actor, Ed Begley, Jr., who  
18 wanted to be here tonight, but was not able to be here. He  
19 has forwarded and submitted a letter, and asked that I read  
20 this into the record.

21 "I'm writing to express my support  
22 for the Cabrillo Port Offshore LNG  
23 project. As an activist within the  
24 environmental community, I'm familiar  
25 with those who articulate opposition to

T001-9

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

COMMENTS T001-9
--------------------



1 development projects, especially energy  
2 projects. But there are times when it  
3 is important to state what we are for.  
4 I am for Cabrillo Port.

5 "I believe it's become clear,  
6 through the extensive environmental  
7 review process conducted by both the  
8 federal and the State agencies, that  
9 Cabrillo Port is an environmentally  
10 responsible energy project, and one that  
11 will be very important for California.  
12 It will be a major natural gas supply  
13 project for the State, something the  
14 State needs, even when California's very  
15 progressive energy-efficiency and  
16 renewable energy goals are considered.

17 "Today, the use of natural gas has  
18 become key to local and State air  
19 quality strategies, it's become the  
20 preferred energy source for industrial  
21 and commercial operations, as well as  
22 for electric generation, because of its  
23 clean-burning characteristics. It's  
24 also increasingly being utilized as an  
25 alternative vehicle fuel. I use it.

1           "While we all agree we should be  
2           conserving energy, the fact is, is that  
3           the use of clean-burning natural gas can  
4           help improve the environment, especially  
5           when it displaces dirtier fossil fuels.  
6           We should be burning more natural gas.

7           "The draft Environmental Impact  
8           Report, for Cabrillo Port, concludes  
9           that 'the proposed project would not  
10          contribute significantly to a cumulative  
11          adverse affect on the region's  
12          environment.'

13          "This means that this important  
14          natural gas supply project can be built  
15          and the environment can be protected.

16          "I believe that the project's far  
17          offshore location has effectively  
18          addressed perceived public safety issues  
19          related to LNG terminals. The project's  
20          location, away from the Channel Island  
21          Marine Sanctuary, with it's self-  
22          contained vaporization processes, and  
23          the fact that it's a floating facility,  
24          moored to the ocean floor, and not a  
25          facility based on an existing petroleum-

1 related platform, are some of the  
2 important factors which ensure a minimal  
3 environmental footprint.

4 "And to those who may decry the  
5 safety of natural gas facilities, let's  
6 remember, natural gas is used safely  
7 every day in our homes, and it's  
8 delivered by long-distance pipelines  
9 that literally crisscross the State.

10 "Furthermore, LNG and natural gas  
11 are nontoxic. They are mostly methane,  
12 one of the cleanest fuels available.

13 "It's time for California to have  
14 an environmentally responsible LNG  
15 facility, that can receive LNG from  
16 ships carrying it in worldwide commerce,  
17 store it, regasify it, when needed, and  
18 deliver needed natural gas to the  
19 marketplace via a pipeline that directly  
20 connects into the existing gas pipeline  
21 system onshore.

22 "The added supplies of natural gas,  
23 that a California energy facility can  
24 deliver, can help clean the air, improve  
25 our energy efficiency, diversify our

1 energy supplies, and stabilize our  
2 prices.

3 "I wish to add my voice and seek to  
4 move this important and environmentally-  
5 responsible energy project forward.

6 Thank you, sincerely, Ed Begley, Jr."

7 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: All right, thank you.

8 I'm going to go ahead and read ahead, again, the  
9 next series of speakers, if you'd come up to the reserve  
10 area. Andy Finan, Vickie Finan, Chance Hardy, Ozzie, I  
11 think it's Silva, Alicia Finigan, and Luis Montoya.

12 Mr. Finan

13 MR. FINAN: Andy Finan. Hi, I oppose the project.

14 I listened to this man about crisscrossing lines of -- lines  
15 in California. I don't think people here know that the  
16 lines are 32 inches wide and have 1,500 PSI in them.

17 It's a very dangerous proposal. I believe it's  
18 market driven. We have the Australian Ambassador over here,  
19 telling us, you know, he's going to buy our stuff, now, if  
20 we can put our LNG plant here.

21 A lot of things have been said already, I don't  
22 want to go over them, our Mayor here did a good job. But  
23 I'm afraid of the project. I live in Silver Strand Beach,  
24 which is probably 20 miles from here. It doesn't sound like  
25 a good thing to me, having a floating terminal off a coast

T001-10.1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T001-10.2

Section 4.2 and Appendix C contain additional and revised information on public safety.

COMMENTER  
T001-10

T001-10.1

T001-10.2



1 and then running these big lines through our communities. I  
 2 think you should move your project somewhere else, where  
 3 you'll have a better chance of getting it.

4 I would also like to extent the comment period  
 5 because people here, today, are listening to a lot of  
 6 ringers coming up here and telling how much they like it,  
 7 because I was at the meeting yesterday, and a few of these  
 8 people were there.

9 I don't think Malibu knows what they're getting  
 10 here. And I know we've had four meetings, but this  
 11 isn't -- when you have 200 people talk to you about, or send  
 12 you letters, after four meetings, I don't know, there's like  
 13 70,000 people that live on this coast and I don't think, you  
 14 know, one percent knows what's going on here.

15 So I would like you to extend the period so there  
 16 would be more comment. Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: The next speaker is  
 19 Vickie Finan.

20 MS. FINAN: Good evening, I'm Vickie Finan, and  
 21 I'm here on behalf of the Beacon Foundation.

22 We are an environmental organization focused on  
 23 Coastal Ventura County.

24 I drove here, from Oxnard, with my husband,  
 25 who -- that was the first time he spoke in public, and I

T001-10.2  
(cont'd)

T001-10.3

T001-10.3

All deepwater port applications fall under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act, which requires that a decision on the application be made within 330 days of the publication of the Notice of Application in the Federal Register. The Notice of Application for the Cabrillo Port Project was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2004. Although the comment period (53 days) could not be extended at that time, a March 2006 Revised Draft EIR was recirculated under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Section 1.4.1 contains additional information on this topic.

Section 1.5 contains information on opportunities for public comment. After the MARAD final license hearing, the public will have 45 days to comment on the Final EIS/EIR and the license application. The Federal and State agencies will have an additional 45 days to provide comments to the MARAD Administrator. The Administrator must issue the Record of Decision within 90 days after the final license hearing. The CSLC will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease. The California Coastal Commission will also hold a hearing. Comments received will be evaluated before any final decision is made regarding the proposed Project.

COMMENTER  
T001-11

1 think he's done this all his life.

2 So anyway, I want to ask for an additional amount  
3 of time. This is too much, too of an important project to  
4 not allow the public an opportunity to find out what the  
5 hazards are going to be with this project.

6 I happen to live in Oxnard, and last night was the  
7 first time that I heard that there would be, potentially,  
8 having a 32-inch pipeline go down the center of Gonzales  
9 Road, past two brand-new high schools, and an elementary  
10 school that's just been built in the last few years.

11 So the other route is also going to go by many  
12 other schools, and many other people that need to be  
13 informed about this, and they have not been informed.

14 I would ask that you extend the comment period  
15 through 60 days.

16 And the other concern that I have, that I don't  
17 think is very well known here, is that this is a platform  
18 that is floating, it's not stationery. So the wave actions  
19 are going one direction, the winds can be blowing it another  
20 way, and then we can have an earthquake, and it's just far  
21 too dangerous, too many people in this area. And I would  
22 hope that you would extend the time so more people could be  
23 informed and let you know how they feel.

24 Thank you.

25 (Applause.)

T001-11.1

T001-11.1

All deepwater port applications fall under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act, which requires that a decision on the application be made within 330 days of the publication of the Notice of Application in the Federal Register. The Notice of Application for the Cabrillo Port Project was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2004. Although the comment period (53 days) could not be extended at that time, a March 2006 Revised Draft EIR was recirculated under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Section 1.4.1 contains additional information on this topic.

T001-11.2

Section 1.5 contains information on opportunities for public comment. After the MARAD final license hearing, the public will have 45 days to comment on the Final EIS/EIR and the license application. The Federal and State agencies will have an additional 45 days to provide comments to the MARAD Administrator. The Administrator must issue the Record of Decision within 90 days after the final license hearing. The CSLC will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease. The California Coastal Commission will also hold a hearing. Comments received will be evaluated before any final decision is made regarding the proposed Project.

T001-11.3

T001-11.4

T001-11.2

The Santa Barbara Channel/Mandalay Shore Crossing/Gonzales Road Pipeline Alternative is evaluated as an alternative in the EIS/EIR; it is not the proposed Project as described in Section 2.4.

T001-11.5

T001-11.3

Section 4.13.1 contains information on sensitive land uses in proximity to proposed and alternative pipeline routes, such as schools. There are no schools in the immediate vicinity of either of the proposed pipeline routes. Section 4.2.8 describes regulations regarding pipelines, including the requirement to establish public education programs to prevent and respond to pipeline emergencies. Section 4.2.8.4 contains information on the estimated risk of Project pipeline incidents. Section 4.16.1.2 describes emergency planning and response capabilities in the Project area.

The proposed pipelines within Oxnard city limits would meet

standards that are more stringent than those of existing pipelines because they would meet the minimum design criteria for a U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) Class 3 location. Also, MM PS-4c includes the installation of additional mainline valves equipped with either remote valve controls or automatic line break controls. SoCalGas operates high-pressure natural gas pipelines throughout Southern California.

#### T001-11.4

See response to Comment T001-11-1

#### T001-11.5

Section 4.2 and Appendix C contain additional and revised information on public safety.

As described in Sections 2.1 and 2.3.1, and as depicted on Figure 2.1-1, the FSRU would be a floating facility that would be moored to the seafloor. It would not be a fixed platform.

The FSRU would be located outside of the current boundary of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) and vessels associated with the operations would not be expected to enter the CINMS. Sections 4.7, 4.15, 4.16, and 4.18 describe potential impacts on the marine environment and proposed mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts.

Section 1.2.3 addresses natural gas needs in California and has been updated. Forecast information has been obtained from the California Energy Commission.

Section 4.11 contains revised information on seismic and geologic hazards and mitigation that specifically addresses the potential damage to proposed pipelines from a direct rupture along fault lines. Appendices J1 through J4 contain additional evaluations of seismic hazards.

1 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Chance Hardy.

2 MR. HARDY: My name is Chance Hardy, and I'm one  
3 of those people that does get nervous when speaking, so it  
4 takes a lot, so it takes something important for me to come  
5 out here.

6 I really believe in this project. I believe that  
7 it has a lot of potential and I believe there is a lot of  
8 comments that were addressed in the EIR/EIS, that a lot of  
9 people haven't -- have failed to read. People make these  
10 comments saying that the things need to be changed but then,  
11 again, I don't think they took the time to go out there and  
12 actually read the project proposals.

13 I believe there are some things that are in it  
14 that need to be addressed further, but as far as the  
15 whole -- the whole project goes, I believe that they've done  
16 an outstanding job in what they've done so far, and I  
17 applaud them.

18 That's all, thank you.

19 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: The next speaker is Ozzie  
20 Silna.

21 MR. SILNA: Hello, my name is Ozzie Silna, I'm on  
22 the Board of the California Coastal Protection Network, a  
23 nonprofit, public-benefit organization.

24 While the legal intent of these hearings is to  
25 provide comment and critique on the draft EIS/EIR, prepared

COMMENTER  
T001-12

T001-12

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

COMMENTER  
T001-13

1 by the U.S. Coast Guard, MARAD, and the State Lands  
2 Commission, I feel it is essential to provide testimony, not  
3 just on the numerous and critical deficiencies within the  
4 document, but to provide an overview of a deeply flawed  
5 process that has allowed this proposal to come this far,  
6 this fast.

7 The drive to bring LNG to California, and to the  
8 United States, as a whole, is being driven by the LNG  
9 companies, many of whom are also the oil companies, who see  
10 their next product line on the horizon.

11 But what's happened here and is happening in  
12 numerous small communities across the coastal America, is  
13 that the LNG cart has been placed in front of the public  
14 interest horse.

15 Despite heavy company-funded PR that attempts to  
16 scare the public into believing the sky will fall if we do  
17 not commit ourselves to large-scale LNG projects in the near  
18 term, the question of how dire any shortage will be prior to  
19 2020 is still a matter of debate.

20 Even the Department of Energy and the National  
21 Petroleum Council predict only slight growth by 2020, not  
22 the massive decline predicted by at least one LNG oil  
23 company.

24 And if there is not a massive decline in  
25 production, it is conceivable that we, in California, could

#### T001-13.1

Sections 1.2.2 and 1.2.3 contain updated information on natural gas needs in the U.S. and California. Forecast information has been obtained from the U.S. Department of Energy's Energy Information Agency and from the California Energy Commission.

#### T001-13.2

Section 4.10 contains additional information on energy alternatives.

T001-13.1

T001-13.2



1 bridge the gap with aggressive conservation and renewables,  
2 and not tie ourselves to another fossil fuel, over which we  
3 have little control and which, as we have learned the hard  
4 way, is highly susceptible to market manipulation.

T001-13.2  
(cont'd)

5 So while the jury is still out, the judges seem to  
6 be rushing us to an LNG altar, and the first one down the  
7 aisle is the massive BHP Billiton floating storage and  
8 regasification unit, a moored facility the size of three  
9 football fields, to be anchored about 12 miles off our  
10 coast.

11 To see the determination, within this document, to  
12 provide no other real alternatives, but this one, to  
13 literally ignore any other locations, to reject all other  
14 technologies, to dismiss any combined conservation and  
15 renewable efforts, is to think what we are looking for is  
16 the only answer.

T001-13.3

17 If, after deliberate process, public process,  
18 California decides it needs LNG, then California needs to  
19 take the reins from the heavy hands of the federal  
20 government and figure out how much we need, where the  
21 facility should be located, what technology should be used,  
22 and what scale there should be in order to provide just one  
23 more element of diversity in our energy supply.

T001-13.4

24 Simply put, what we need first is a clear,  
25 accountable statewide evaluation that will assure the best

T001-13.3

Sections 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, and 4.10.1.3 contain information on the need for natural gas, the role and status of energy conservation and renewable energy sources, and the California Energy Action Plan.

T001-13.4

Section 1.1 contains information on the public process being used to evaluate the proposed Project.

Section 2.1 contains information on design criteria and specifications, final design requirements, and regulations governing the construction of the FSRU. The Cabrillo Port must be designed in accordance with applicable standards, and the U.S. Coast Guard has final approval. Section 4.2.4 contains information on Federal and State agency jurisdiction and cooperation. The Deepwater Port Act specifies regulations that all deepwater ports must meet; Section 4.2.7.3 contains information on design and safety standards for the deepwater port. Section 4.2.8.2 contains information on pipeline safety and inspections. The EIS/EIR's analyses have been developed with consideration of these factors and regulations and in full conformance with the requirements of NEPA and the CEQA.

1 interests of the public, and make sure that they are served  
2 in the long term, and there are clear standards for offshore  
3 and onshore LNG facilities, and that they are applied  
4 equally to all applicants.

5 Certification of this document, approval of the  
6 BHP Billiton application would represent a profound shift in  
7 California energy. Demanding deficiencies and --

8 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you, Mr. Silna, your  
9 time is up.

10 MR. SILNA: Okay, I will -- there are colleagues  
11 of mine that will be presenting greater details on these  
12 issues. Thank you.

13 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Yes.

14 (Applause.)

15 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: And again, if you have more  
16 detailed comments, please submit them in writing.

17 Our next speaker is Alicia Finigan.

18 MS. FINIGAN: Good evening. My name is Alicia  
19 Finigan, and I'm an attorney for the Environmental Defense  
20 Center, a nonprofit, public-interest law firm located in  
21 Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties.

22 I'm testifying, today, on behalf of the California  
23 Coastal Protection Network.

24 My comments will focus on the inadequate analysis  
25 of several impact areas in the draft EIS/EIR, which would

T001-13.4  
(cont'd)

COMMENTS  
T001-14

1 require the agencies to collect additional information, thus  
 2 providing a legal basis to suspend the Deepwater Port Act  
 3 timelines, to allow for a complete and accurate  
 4 environmental review.

T001-14.1

5 The first issue I'd like to address is safety.  
 6 Using the correct methodology is critical to determine the  
 7 extent of appropriate exclusion zones and the impacts on the  
 8 ecosystem.

T001-14.2

9 Specifically, and most importantly, the  
 10 consequence modeling methodologies, used to calculate the  
 11 exclusion zones for the various spill scenarios, are fatally  
 12 flawed in this document.

13 The draft EIS/EIR uses a vapor dispersion and  
 14 thermoradiation consequence modeling program that is not  
 15 appropriate for LNG spills over water.

16 Instead, methodologies developed and approved from  
 17 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission should have been  
 18 utilized, since they were intended for consequence modeling  
 19 for LNG explosions on water.

T001-14.3

20 The second area I'd like to discuss is shipping.  
 21 The EIS mischaracterizes the FSRU's proximity to the  
 22 shipping lanes by calculating the distance from the center  
 23 of the lanes to the FSRU, instead of calculating the  
 24 distance from the edge of the lanes to the FSRU.

T001-14.4

25 Additionally, the increase in vessel traffic and

T001-14.1

All deepwater port applications fall under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act, which requires that a decision on the application be made within 330 days of the publication of the Notice of Application in the Federal Register. The Notice of Application for the Cabrillo Port Project was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2004. Although the comment period (53 days) could not be extended at that time, a March 2006 Revised Draft EIR was recirculated under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Section 1.4.1 contains additional information on this topic.

Section 1.5 contains information on opportunities for public comment. After the MARAD final license hearing, the public will have 45 days to comment on the Final EIS/EIR and the license application. The Federal and State agencies will have an additional 45 days to provide comments to the MARAD Administrator. The Administrator must issue the Record of Decision within 90 days after the final license hearing. The CSLC will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease. The California Coastal Commission will also hold a hearing. Comments received will be evaluated before any final decision is made regarding the proposed Project.

T001-14.2

The Independent Risk Assessment (IRA) has been updated since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR. The lead agencies directed preparation of the current IRA, and the U.S. Department of Energy's Sandia National Laboratories independently reviewed it, as discussed in Section 4.2 and Appendix C.

Section 4.2.7.6 and the IRA (Appendix C1) discuss the models and assumptions used and the verification process. Sandia National Laboratories (Appendix C2) concluded that the models used were appropriate and produced valid results.

T001-14.3

The Project is regulated by the USCG and MARAD under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act. FERC's regulations are prescriptive and standardized to address the general siting of onshore LNG terminals. In contrast, due to various different designs

of deepwater ports, the USCG conducts site-specific independent risk and consequence analyses using the most recent guidance and modeling techniques. The guidance used for Cabrillo Port is Sandia National Laboratories' "Guidance on Risk Analysis and Safety Implications of a Large Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Spill Over Water." This report recommends a framework for analyses of large LNG spills onto water. It was prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), and an external peer review panel evaluated the analyses, conclusions, and recommendations presented.

#### T001-14.4

Sections 4.3.1 and 4.20.3 contain additional information on the distance from the FSRU to the traffic separation lanes and increases in vessel traffic. Section 4.3.4 contains revised text on marine traffic.



1 size has also been excluded from the impact analysis and  
 2 needs to be considered to accurately reflect those shipping  
 3 impacts.

T001-14.4  
(cont'd)

4 The third area I'd like to discuss is air quality.  
 5 The project's total air pollutant emissions, both from  
 6 stationery and mobile sources, are considerable, and will  
 7 require the purchase of emissions credits.

T001-14.5

8 However, the draft EIS/EIR provides no analysis of  
 9 the feasibility of obtaining these credits.

10 Also, the draft EIS provides no analysis of  
 11 pollutant transport or secondary air quality affects on  
 12 other vessel traffic. Will there be longer idling or  
 13 detours of vessels due to the exclusion zones and also  
 14 during construction?

T001-14.6

15 Lastly, the project has significant impacts to the  
 16 marine ecosystem, they're inadequately analyzed. Such as  
 17 the introduction of invasive species from ballast water and  
 18 noise pollution. Underwater noise pollution could  
 19 significantly impact marine wildlife in the South Coast  
 20 region, such as whales, dolphins, pinnipeds, and fishes.

T001-14.7

21 Increased large vessel traffic to and from the  
 22 FSRU will further elevate the ambient underwater noise  
 23 levels in the area, potentially impacting the ability for  
 24 resident Blue and Fin Whales to find food and mates due to  
 25 the masking of critical long-distance vocalizations.

T001-14.8

T001-14.5

The USEPA has made a preliminary determination, on which the lead agencies must rely, that the FSRU should be permitted in the same manner as sources on the Channel Islands that are part of Ventura County. Section 4.6.2 contains an updated discussion of relevant regulatory requirements.

T001-14.6

Sections 4.3.1.2 and 4.3.1.3 provide information on marine traffic during construction and operational activities. Section 4.3.4 contains information on potential impacts to marine traffic. As described in these sections, the effect on non-Project vessel transport is expected to be minimal. Thus, no air quality impacts were identified for any changes to vessel traffic caused by Project construction or operation.

T001-14.7

LNG carriers would exchange ballast water outside of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (200 NM) and would only take on ballast water when docked at the FSRU, so non-native invasive species would not be introduced. Section 4.7.2 contains information on regulations to prevent the introduction of non-native invasive species.

T001-14.8

Impact BioMar-5 in Section 4.7.4 contains updated information on potential noise impacts on the marine environment and mitigation measures to address such impacts.



1           Elevated ambient noise levels, due to LNG tanker  
2   traffic and regasification operations, may also mask  
3   important environmental and interspecies cues for pinnipeds  
4   and fishes, many of which rely heavily on unimpeded hearing  
5   for survival.

6           Thank you.

7           (Applause.)

8           MODERATOR MICHAELSON:   Luis Montoya.

9           MR. MONTOYA:   Good evening.   My name's Luis  
10   Montoya, and I'm an intern at the Environmental Defense  
11   Center.

12           My purpose is to request a full analysis of  
13   project alternatives, that was absent from the DEIS/DEIR.

14           The document states the Cabrillo Port LNG Terminal  
15   will supply California with 800 million cubic feet of  
16   natural gas per day.   The document also forecasts that  
17   California will demand 2.4 trillion cubic feet per year, of  
18   natural gas, by 2013.

19           Based on these figures, it should be noted that by  
20   2013 Cabrillo Port will be supplying 12 percent of the  
21   natural gas used in the State of California.

22           A study, conducted by the American Council for an  
23   Energy-Efficient Economy, proves that California can reduce  
24   its demand of natural gas by more than 15 percent within the  
25   next five years through efficiency and consumption reduction

T001-14.8  
(cont'd)

COMMENTER  
T001-15

T001-15.1

T001-15.1

Sections 1.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 4.10, and 4.10.1.3 contain information on the range of alternatives evaluated. Under NEPA and the CEQA, a reasonable range of alternatives must be considered. NEPA requires consideration of a "reasonable" number of alternatives. In determining the scope of alternatives, the emphasis is on "reasonable." "Reasonable" alternatives include those that are practical and feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense (CEQ 40 Questions; #2a).

The information must be sufficient to enable reviewers and decision-makers to evaluate and compare alternatives. The State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(a) provides, in part, "An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project."

The EIS/EIR initially evaluated 18 locations for the FSRU as potential locations for the deepwater port. It built on previous California Coastal Commission studies that evaluated nearly 100 locations. Sections 3.3.7 and 3.3.9 discuss alternate locations and technologies that were considered.

1 techniques.

2 For example, by reducing natural gas consumption  
3 in the commercial sector, California can save 5.1 percent  
4 off its current natural gas use by 2009.

5 Similarly, 4.8 percent can be saved through  
6 efficiency and demand reduction in the residential sector.

7 California's industrial sector has the most  
8 potential for improvement, in that it can reduce its natural  
9 gas use by 5.2 percent within the next five years.

10 By implementing more efficient technologies in  
11 these three sectors, California could save a total of 15.3  
12 percent off its current gas demand. We would, therefore,  
13 save more natural gas in this manner than Cabrillo Port  
14 would supply.

15 These estimates of natural gas savings are based  
16 on already-available technologies and feasible practices.

17 My research has further revealed that a large  
18 quantity of natural gas can additionally be saved by  
19 refurbishing some of California's oldest, least efficient  
20 electric power plants.

21 If we replace the least-efficient, non-peaking  
22 power plants with combined-cycled turbines, that are already  
23 used at newer facilities, California would use 174 billion  
24 cubic feet per year less natural gas than at present.

25 This is a savings equivalent to approximately 70

T001-15.1  
(cont'd)

1 percent of the natural gas to be supplied by the Cabrillo  
2 Port project.

T001-15.1  
(cont'd)

3           These examples are meant to illustrate the project  
4 alternatives that are not given enough consideration in the  
5 DEIS/DEIR. More efficient use of natural gas would reduce  
6 demand to the point that the Cabrillo Port project would no  
7 longer be necessary.

8           The decision made on this project will set a  
9 standard for California's energy future. Since energy  
10 efficiency is more environmentally benign than the proposed  
11 project, it is the duty of the lead agencies to properly  
12 explore this project alternative.

13           We must not increase our dependence on -- we must  
14 not increase our dependence on foreign fossil fuel sources.  
15 We must, instead, take action to reduce demand for natural  
16 gas and move California towards a state of energy  
17 independence.

18           Thank you.

19           (Applause.)

20           MODERATOR MICHAELSON: I'm going to read ahead,  
21 again, the next series of speakers. Linda Krop, Peter  
22 Torrell, Bob Hattoy, Valerie Dunwoody, Kraig Hill, and Alan  
23 Sanders. If you would come take a seat over here, in the  
24 reserved seating area.

25           Linda Krop.